



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,904	12/04/2001	Paul St John Brittan	B-4406 619356-8	7194

7590 10/08/2004

HEWLET PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. BOX 272400
3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATIN
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527

EXAMINER

ABEBE, DANIEL DEMELASH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2655

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/005,904	Applicant(s) BRITTAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Daniel D Abebe	Art Unit 2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8-13, 17 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8-13, 17-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The double patenting rejection issued on the previous office action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saylor et al. (6,501,832)

As to claim 1, Saylor teaches a method of setting voice personality of a voice server site (vpage server) (Fig.8); **"The voice personalization features may be set by a user upon subscribing and automatically applied when that user logs into the system.** Personalization module 40 retrieves information **from subscriber database** once he logs onto the VNAP. In doing so, the caller does not need to specify his information at any point during the session" (Col.19, lines 12-20).

As to claim 2, Saylor teaches wherein the vpage server sites serve voice pages in the form of VoxML tags and where these tags are interpreted (Fig.7 and 1)

As to claim 3, Saylor teaches where the speech is synthesized according to the voice personality stored at the user profile database "VNAP 12 may also comprise a voice output generation module 38 for outputting voice signals. Voice output generation module 38 may comprise a text-to-voice conversion module for "reading" text files as

Art Unit: 2655

voice output or any other type of module for taking a data file and generating voice output to be directed by input output module 26 to the appropriate user. Optionally, a voice personalization module 40 may be provided that enables a user to select personalized features for the voice content. Personalization features may include tone, pitch, language, speed, gender, volume, accent, and other voice options that a user may desire to make the information more understandable or desirable". (Col.18, line 66-Col.19, line 11).

As to claims 8-9 and 17-18, Saylo teaches where the user profile is stored in a database for consulting the voice personality by plurality of voice sites and where the personalization includes language, accent..etc. (Fig.7).

Claims 10-12 are analogous to the claims addressed above and are rejected for the foregoing reasons by Saylor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Jay et al. (WO 01/91109 A1).

As to claims 4 and 13, Saylor teaches where text voice pages are interpreted to speech using the voice personality designated by the user. However, Saylor doesn't teach where the text to speech system is concatenation. Jay however teaches a system for providing a voice page using a voice personality where the page is interpreted by concatenation synthesis technology (page 2, lines 8-10; Col.8, lines 26-28).

Therefore, One skilled in the art will appreciate that while the invention in Saylor is disclosed where a parameteric synthesis appears to be used the invention could also be programmed or modified, in view of Jay art, to work where the well known concatenate synthesis system is used.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 7/22/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The present invention is generally related to the personalization of voice pages to a user. In the argument applicant argues that Saylor doesn't teach where the voice personalities are determined from sites the user visited before and set. The examiner disagree. Saylor teaches a system (300) comprising a voice browser (35), a user device (14) and voice server (43), where voice personalities for contents accessed from a server are presented using personality set by the voice browser. According to Saylor, In addition to setting the voice personality according to the user profile, Saylor explains where information about the user, including voice setting information, is stored in the subscriber statistical database "so that when the user enters the system the information in the database is used during the session" and where the user information is updated (Col.26, line 55-Col.27, line 9; Col. 27, lines 32-55). Saylor also states that "The voice browser also stores the user's information in its session information for later use. usage statistics regarding the retrieval are logged in the user statistics database 82. In step 1622, the user may request a new page". Therefore the examiner submit

Art Unit: 2655

that Saylor teaches where the voice personality is set as claimed in the present invention.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel D Abebe whose telephone number is 703-308-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 703-305-4827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel Abebe Primary Examiner A.U. 2655

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel Abebe', with a stylized flourish at the end.

October 3, 2004